IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Tim Corey,)	C/A No. 5:11-1078-TMC-KDW
DI : .: (CC)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	ORDER
Michael Labbshire; Rob Peele; J Franklin;)	
Ms Young; Ms Bell; Ms Moss; Marcia)	
Fuller,)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on December 21, 2011. [Entry # 42]. As Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order on December 22, 2011, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. [Entry # 43]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending this case. The Plaintiff did file a Motion for Summary Judgment on or about September 6, 2012, and while the court will consider that in addressing the Defendants' motion for summary judgment, it is not responsive to the Defendants' motion.

As originally noted in the court's *Roseboro* Order of December 22, 2011, Plaintiff is again reminded that if he fails to respond adequately to the Defendants' motion, the court may grant the Defendants' motion, which may end Plaintiff's case. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants' motion for summary judgment by February 21, 2012. Plaintiff

is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 3, 2012 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Hayman D. Hest